





THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES

From the Library of  
CHARLES DONALD O'MALLEY  
1907 - 1970









# JOANNES MATTHÆUS AND HIS TRACT

“DE RERUM INVENTORIBUS.”

---

BY

JOHN FERGUSON,

M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., F.S.A.,

PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

---

GLASGOW:

PRINTED FOR THE ROYAL PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY  
OF GLASGOW

BY CARTER AND PRATT.

1902.





# JOANNES MATTHÆUS AND HIS TRACT

“DE RERUM INVENTORIBUS.”

---

BY

JOHN FERGUSON,

M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., F.S.A.,

PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

---

GLASGOW :

PRINTED FOR THE ROYAL PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY  
OF GLASGOW

BY CARTER AND PRATT.

1902.



*Joannes Mattheus and his Tract "De Rerum Inventoribus."*

By JOHN FERGUSON, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., etc., Professor  
of Chemistry in the University of Glasgow.

---

[Read before the Society, 4th December, 1901.]\*

---

1. THERE is an Italian author of the sixteenth century who wrote a small treatise on the original inventors of various things. His name was Joannes Matthæus Lunensis. His book was edited by Agostino Giustiniani, Bishop of Nebbio, in Corsica.

2. There is another Italian author of the same century, who wrote odes and hymns, and a translation of the psalms in Latin verse. His name was Joannes Matthæus Toscanus. Some of his works are said to have been edited by Jean Dorat (Joannes Auratus), the Court poet of France.

3. Is there here one man under two different appellations, or are they two different men? In other words, are the epithets "Toscanus" and "Lunensis" synonymous? The question is legitimate, for the persons have been identified or confused by some writers, while, by others, they have been practically, if not explicitly, distinguished.

4. The first reference to the book about inventors I met with was that by Beckmann,<sup>1</sup> and, without having seen a copy of it, I mentioned it on his authority.<sup>2</sup> Subsequently, I found one in Sir William Hamilton's collection (now in the University Library, Glasgow), and gave a notice of it and of its author.<sup>3</sup>

On that occasion I accepted what had been said about him by Jöcher, to whom Beckmann refers, unaware of any possible difficulty in the matter. But, having had cause subsequently to dis-

---

[\* The first draft of this paper was read to the Bibliographical Society of Edinburgh, 11th January, 1900. It was afterwards elaborated in detail, and entirely re-written.]

<sup>1</sup> *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Erfindungen*, Leipzig, 1702, III. p. 559.

<sup>2</sup> "Notes on some Books of Receipts," . . . in *Transactions of the Archaeological Society*, Glasgow, 1883, II. p. 232.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 1896, N.S. II. p. 369.

trust Jöcher on this point, I have become doubtful of the accuracy of the account of Joannes Matthæus which I formerly wrote, and I intend now to re-examine the whole subject.

5. Jöcher<sup>4</sup> states that Joannes Matthæus, a native of Tuscany, was the author of a tract *De Rerum et Artium Inventoribus*, edited by Augustinus Justinianus, of a translation of the psalms into Latin verse, and of original odes, hymns and poems in Latin, which were edited by Joannes Auratus. There can be obviously no uncertainty about Jöcher's opinion.

In an attempt to discover something more about the author of the tract *De Rerum Inventoribus*, I failed to find his name in the later biographical dictionaries, and thus learned that he and his book are practically forgotten. Accordingly, I turned to writers prior to Jöcher, and soon ascertained that they are by no means concordant. It may, therefore, be as well at this point to collect and compare the different statements.

6. The name Joannes Matthæus, both with and without a qualifying epithet, is not uncommon. There is a Joannes Matthæus ex Ferrariis, or de Gradibus, "philosophus insignis, medicus illustrissimus," as he is styled by Gesner, in the middle of the fifteenth century. He wrote commentaries on Rhazes and Avicenna. A theologian, who wrote commentaries and controversial works on theological questions, towards the end of the sixteenth century was known as Joannes Matthæus Smalcaldensis. He was a professor at Wittenberg, and died September 18, 1588.<sup>5</sup> Another physician and author was Joannes Matthæus Hessus, whose books appeared in the early years of the seventeenth century. Besides these, there are the two authors now under consideration, Joannes Matthæus Lunensis, and Joannes Matthæus Toscanus, to whom may be added a certain Matthæus Toscanus.

With the first three there is no difficulty. They are easily distinguished from each other, and from the other three, and as they have no bearing on the present question, they need not occupy us any further.

7. The earliest mention of Joannes Matthæus Lunensis, of which I am aware, is in the appendix to Conrad Gesner's *Bibliotheca*, where there is ascribed to him the work *De Mulieribus*

<sup>4</sup> *Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon*, Leipzig, 1751, III. col. 287-8.

<sup>5</sup> Freher, *Theatrum Virorum Eruditione Clarorum*, Norib. 1688, I. p. 274.

*Claris*, published at Paris in 1520.<sup>6</sup> Reference will be made to this book further on. The *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus* is not included, and as for the name of Joannes Matthæus Toscanus, it does not appear in it till the edition of 1583, when he is spoken of as the author of a translation of the psalms.

8. Next in order of time is Georgius Draudius, who certainly draws a distinction between the two writers. Under Joannes Matthæus Lunensis he places<sup>7</sup> the tracts about inventors and about famous women, but he gets into some confusion over the other, for he ascribes to Joannes Matthæus Toscanus the translation of the psalms,<sup>8</sup> the collection of Italian poets who wrote in Latin,<sup>9</sup> and the *Anthologia Epigrammatum*,<sup>10</sup> although the compiler of this last work is called Matthæus Toscanus simply, and not Joannes. As for the *Peplus Italie* he has got its author's name wrong, for he styles him Joannes Maria Toscanus.<sup>11</sup> This same error crops up subsequently.

9. Notwithstanding these entries by Draudius, Hallervord<sup>12</sup> puts the *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus*, 1520, and the *Peplus Italie*, 1578, under the same author, whom he terms Joannes Matthæus Lunensis, with the additional epithet "Hetruscus," which, though more general, comes practically to the same thing. This is as plainly an identification of the two authors. The epithet *Hetruscus*, it may be remarked, was never employed by either Matthæus Lunensis or Toscanus.

10. König's<sup>13</sup> article is almost a copy of the preceding. He, too, styles Matthæus "Lunensis, Hetruscus," and makes him author both of the *De Rerum Inventoribus*, 1520, and *Peplus Italie*. But under Toscanus,<sup>14</sup> whose name does not appear in Hallervord's list, he puts the metrical version of the psalms, 1596, but not the

<sup>6</sup> *Bibliotheca Universalis*, Tiguri, 1545, Appendix, f. 67 verso. The same entry is repeated in the subsequent editions of 1555 (*Paralipomena*) p. 184; 1574, p. 394; 1583, p. 394. For Toscanus, see 1583, p. 471.

<sup>7</sup> *Bibliotheca Classica*, Francofurti ad Moenum, 1625, I. p. 1155 and p. 1189 (misprinted 1198).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, II. p. 1586.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, II. p. 1521 and 1558. In the former of these the name is misspelt *Tossanus*, which might make a confusion with a Petrus, a Daniel, and a Paulus Tossanus, all of whom are known.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, II. p. 1534.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, I. p. 1285.

<sup>12</sup> *Bibliotheca Curiosa*, Regiomonti et Francofurti, 1676, p. 180.

<sup>13</sup> *Bibliotheca Vetus et Nova*, . . . à Georgio Matthia Königio, Altdorfi . . . 1678, p. 519.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 815.

*Peplus*, so that his statements about these authors conflict with those of Draudius.

11. The entries in the catalogue of the Barberini library explicitly discriminate between our authors. Under Matthæus<sup>15</sup> appears the *De Rerum Inventoribus*, 1613, and under Toscanus<sup>16</sup> the *Carmina*. It is true that to Matthæus are apparently ascribed also certain medical tracts which were written a century later by J. Matthæus Hessus, but that confusion is easily rectified, and does not concern us now.

12. A variation on the preceding entries was introduced by Antoine Teissier,<sup>17</sup> who distinguished the two in a different way. He names them both Joannes Matthæus, but to one he gives the epithet *Lunensis*, to the other *Toscanus*, which he evidently regards as a mere adjective, and not as an essential part of the name. Under *Lunensis* are given both the *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus*, 1614 (*sic*), and *Opus De Mulieribus Claris*, 1520, but no mention is made of a 1520 edition of the former tract.

The *Peplus Italie*, 1578, is ascribed to Toscanus, and there is quoted, on Ph. Labbe's authority, a copy with additions and corrections in the author's hand, in the possession of Raphael Trichet Dufresne, "*qui Bibliothecam Historicorum Italie magno studio adornabat.*" The other works of Toscanus are not referred to because they did not come within the scope of Teissier's list. Apparently, while discriminating between these authors, he has not quite grasped the real ground of difference.

13. Only the tract *De Rerum Inventoribus*, by Jo. Matthæus Lunensis, misdated 1620, is mentioned by Jacob Friedrich Reimmann,<sup>18</sup> who, moreover, warns his readers not to confuse him with Joannes Matthæus Smalcaldensis.

14. Zedler, also, quoting Hallervord, mentions only the *Peplus Italie*, 1578, and *De Inventoribus Rerum*, 1520 and 1613, and assigns both to Lunensis.<sup>19</sup> But Zedler has also an article<sup>20</sup> under

<sup>15</sup> *Index Bibliothecæ quæ Franciscus Barberinus . . . Magnificentissimæ suæ Familicæ ad Quirinalem Aedem magnificentiores reddidit.* Romæ, 1681, II. p. 43.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 473.

<sup>17</sup> *Catalogus Auctorum quæ Librorum Catalogos, Indices, Bibliothecas, Virorum Litteratorum Elogia, Vitas, aut Orationes Fimbres, Scriptis consignarunt.* Genève, 1686, 4to, p. 190.

<sup>18</sup> *Versuch einer Einleitung in die Historiam literariam antediluvianam,* Halle im Magdeb. 1709, p. 213.

<sup>19</sup> *Universal-Lexicon*, Leipzig, 1739, XIX. col. 2105.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 1745, XLIV. col. 1613

'Toscanus,' whom he credits with the *Anthologia Epigrammatum*, 1619, and *Peplus Italiae*, 1658 (*sic*).

Zedler's double entries indicate either forgetfulness on the part of a single author of the two paragraphs, or else emanation from quite different writers, but, anyhow, as they are full of confusion, they have the effect of increasing the obscurity, and contributing to the identification of the two writers which we find at last completed in Jöcher.

15. In speaking of the *Peplus Italiae*, 1578, Jo. Albertus Fabricius<sup>21</sup> ascribes it to Toscanus, and makes no reference to any other works either by him or by Lunensis. He repeats what is said by Teissier about a copy with the author's emendations, but adds that he could not discover what had become of it.

16. Though Jöcher identifies the two authors as far as their works are concerned, he does not style the writer either Lunensis or Toscanus; perhaps he was bothered by the conflict of authorities, was not sure about the epithets, and thought it most judicious to drop them entirely. He commits the mistake, also, of calling him Matthæi, instead of Matthæus, but he evidently looks upon that as his family name. Jöcher enumerates only the *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus* 1520 and 1613, and *Psalmi Davidis . . . hymni et poemata*, Paris, 1576.

17. Lessing,<sup>22</sup> who has devoted a section to the author of the *De Rerum Inventoribus*, follows Jöcher as to his having written poems edited by Joannes Auratus, but he, too, avoids the epithets Lunensis and Toscanus.

18. Even Beckmann,<sup>23</sup> who is so careful in general, has taken Jöcher's statement for granted, and assigned the authorship of the *Peplus Italiae*, as well as of the Latin poems, to Joannes Matthæus Lunensis.

19. Singularly enough, while Graesse has omitted both authors from his great catalogue,<sup>24</sup> he has mentioned and clearly distinguished them in his *Literärsgeschichte*. Toscanus, whom he too misnames Maria, was, he says, a native of Milan, known by poetic biographies of his contemporaries, and Graesse refers to the *Peplus*

<sup>21</sup> *Conspectus Thesauri Literarii Italiae*, Hamburgi, 1730, p. 285.

<sup>22</sup> *Kollektionen zur Literatur*, Berlin, 1790. II. pp. 142-145.

<sup>23</sup> Sup. § 4, note 1.

<sup>24</sup> *Trésor de Livres Rares*, Dresde, 1859-1860.

*Italiæ*, Lutet., 1578, 8vo, and the reprint by Fabricius, *Consp. Ital.*, p. 369.<sup>25</sup>

The other he calls Johann Matthæus, of Luna, in Tuscany, who wrote on the history of inventions, mentioning the Paris edition of 1520, and that of Hamburg, 1613.<sup>26</sup>

It is obvious that Graesse not only considered them as quite distinct, but as having different names, the poet being called Toscanus, the historian Matthæus, thus differing from Teissier and Jöcher.

20. From these extracts it will be seen how much uncertainty envelopes the individuality of these writers. None of the authorities (except perhaps Draudius), gives a full list of their respective works if they were believed to be different, or collectively if they were believed to be identical.

It is also worth remarking that they are neither of them mentioned by writers on rare books. Either their works were so rare that they were not known at all, or else they were not considered of sufficient importance to be noticed.

When, therefore I identified these writers,<sup>27</sup> I followed what I thought were sound authorities, and omitted to subject them to the scrutiny which the foregoing comparison proves plainly was necessary. If I erred, it was, truly, in respectable company, but that is no excuse for not having made sure of my guides.

21. The two authors may now be specially considered. Of Joannes Matthæus Toscanus, who, for convenience, may be called simply Toscanus, there is the briefest notice in the biographical dictionaries and histories.

Tiraboschi<sup>28</sup> speaks of him as Giammatteo Toscano, a Milanese, who lived a long time in France. De Angelis<sup>29</sup> possibly simply copying Tiraboschi, says he was born at Milan, adding that it was towards the end of the fifteenth century, but no year is mentioned. Graesse,<sup>30</sup> in turn, repeats that he was a Milanese. Peter Burmann,<sup>31</sup> referring to a promised third volume of Italian poets,

<sup>25</sup> *Lehrbuch einer allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte*. . . . Leipzig, 1852, V. p. 1214, and p. 1226, note 107.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid*, 1853, VI. p. 789, and p. 790, note 2.

<sup>27</sup> Sup. § 4, note 3.

<sup>28</sup> *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, Firenze, 1812, VII. iii. p. 1025.

<sup>29</sup> *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, no date, XLII. p. 2.

<sup>30</sup> Sup. § 19, note 25.

<sup>31</sup> *Infr.* § 25.



which, however, never appeared, calls him Joannes Matthæus Toscanus. So, too, Crescimbeni,<sup>32</sup> who quotes both the *Peplus Italie* and the *Carmina Poetarum Italorum* more than once, calls the author Toscanus, with or without his christian names. All these authorities seem to me to consider that Toscanus, whatever it may have signified originally, was his family name, and not a mere birthplace appellation, as it was certainly regarded by Teissier, and must have been by Jöcher.

22. His writings are well known. The following, which I have seen, form, I believe, a complete list.

1565. Adr. Tyrnebi | Ad Academiam | Parisiensem | Προσωποποιία |  
Auctore Io. Mattheo Toscano Romano. | [Device.]  
Parisiis | Apud Thomam Richardum, sub Bibliis aureis, | ἐ regione  
collegij Rhemensis | 1565. |

Small 4°. A in fours. Aj, Title leaf; Aij *recto*, folio 2, Text of the poem begins; it ends Aiiij *verso*, folio 3; Aiiij is blank.

This is one of the multitudinous elegies called forth by the death of the famous professor of Greek, at Paris. It is included in the author's collected poems, 1575, p. 55, but this 1565 edition is not quoted by the bibliographers.

23. 1575. Psalmi Davidis ex hebraïca veritate latinis versibus expressi.  
. . . Quibus præfixa sunt Argumenta singulis Distichis comprehensa,  
opera Io. Aurati Poetæ Regij.<sup>33</sup>

Parisiis. Ex Officina Federici Morelli . . . 1575. Svo.

The edition cited by Draudius (*Bibliotheca Classica*, 1625, II. p. 1586), has the date 1576. That by König (*Bibliotheca Vetus et Nova*, 1678, p. 815), has the date 1596. I suspect this is a misprint. I have seen no other reference to a copy of this date.

24. 1575. Octo Cantica Sacrae Sacris Bibliis latino carmine expressa . . .  
præfixis argumentis Io. Aurati Poetæ Regij. Ejusdem Toscani Hymni  
et Poemata. . . .

Parisiis. Ex Officina Federici Morelli . . . 1575. Svo.

This volume contains paraphrases of the songs of Zacharias, Anna, Simeon, etc., hymns, epigrams, and odes. Draudius quotes an edition of 1576, and so does Jöcher, possibly a re-issue with a new title page.

<sup>32</sup> *L'istoria della Volgar Poesia scritta da Gio. Mario Crescimbeni*, Venezia, 1731. 4°.

<sup>33</sup> Olaus Borrichius, who has just a line to spare for Io. Auratus (*Dissertationes Academicæ de Poetis*, Francof. 1683, 4 p. 111), does not mention Toscanus among either Italian or French poets.

The statement that the psalms, hymns, and odes were edited by Joannes Auratus (Jean Dorat) (§ 2), seems to have originated with Jöcher by a misunderstanding of what Auratus really did, which was simply to prefix the arguments to the psalms and odes in the form of a couplet. The only other writer who either repeats Jöcher or makes the remark afresh is De Angelis, who says of the psalms:—"Ce dernier ouvrage fut publié par Dorat son ami, dont il se vantait d'être l'élève. Il l'avait connu à la cour de Catherine de Médicis, dont il fut particulièrement le protégé."

25. 1576-77. *Carmina Illvstrivm Poetarvm Itolorvm*. . . . Tomvs Primvs.

Lvtetice. Apud .Egidium Gorbinum. . . . 1576. . . .

Id. Tomvs Secvndvs. 1577. 16mo.

Apparently there was to have been a third volume, but it never appeared.<sup>34</sup>

26. 1578. *Peplus Italie*. Io. M. Toscani Opvs, in quo illustres viri . . . (quotquot trecentis abhinc annis tota Italia floruerunt) eorumque patrie, professiones, & litterarum monumenta tum carmine tum soluta oratione recensentur.

Lvtetice. Ex Officina Federici Morelli. . . . 1578. 8vo.

Draudius (l. p. 1285), puts the imprint and date in his wonted curtailed fashion: "Lutet. ap. Morel, 58," meaning 1558. This is, of course, a misprint for 78, that is, 1578, but it has had the effect (so prolific is inaccuracy) of producing another blunder. For, in his article on *Toscanus*, Zedler (sup. § 14) assigns to this book the date 1658, referring also to Fabricius' reprint. This date, 1658, is Draudius's original misprint, writ large, and misinterpreted by a whole century. The culmination of the confusion and the vengeance upon the blunder are to be found in Zedler's article on Joannes Matthæus (Lunensis). For there, where the *Peplus Italie* has no business to be, as not having been written by Matthæus, it is correctly dated 1578.

27. 1722. *Toscanus'* poems were reprinted in a collection entitled: *Carmina Illustrium Poetarum Itolorum*, Florentie, MDCCXXII. 8vo.

They are contained in Vol. IX., pp. 283-387, and are reprinted from the edition of 1576.

28. 1730. The *Peplus Italie* was reprinted from the 1578 edition by Jo. Alb. Fabricius at the end of his *Conspectus Thesauri Litterarii Italie*, Hamburgi, 1730, 8vo. It occupies pp. 369-531 of this volume. The

<sup>34</sup> *Anthologia Veterum Latinorum Epigrammatum et Poematum*, by Petrus Hermannus, Jr. Amstel, 1759, l., p. xiv.

remainder of this edition re-appeared at Hamburg, 1749, with a new title page, and with the epistle and contents reprinted.

In the preface addressed to "Antonius Ebrardus Sansuplicianus Episcopus et Comes Cadurcensis," Toscanus refers to the collection of Italian poets already published by him, the aim of which was not only to celebrate his own countrymen, but to stir up others to do the same for theirs. And now, with a similar motive, he published the present collection.

The *Peplus Italiæ* is rather an interesting piece of work, and affords one or two items bearing upon the present discussion. It consists of four books of epigrams on distinguished men of Italy, from Dante to Joannes Carga, a period of three hundred years. There are 200 epigrams in all, numbered consecutively, and they display on the part of the author knowledge of the men, and of events connected with them, aptness of expression and facility in verse writing. Each epigram is followed by a brief notice in prose of the subject of it, indicating his more important works. This seems to have been a favourite form for short biographies, and there is something of the same kind in Paolo Giovio's "Inscriptioni." On account of the biographical details which it supplies, the *Peplus Italiæ* is still occasionally quoted. I have noticed that on such occasions the author is not called Matthæus, but Toscanus.<sup>35</sup>

29. With regard to his death there is a want of definite information. Tiraboschi says that he wrote the *Peplus Italiæ*, first printed at Paris in 1578, and probably died towards the end of the sixteenth century. De Angelis<sup>36</sup> makes the following remark: "Il mourut en France peu après l'année, 1576." If the works above mentioned, the psalms and the sacred poems, had been actually edited by Joannes Auratus, it would imply that Toscanus was dead before 1575.

But, on the other hand, the *Peplus Italiæ*, the preface to which is dated 1578, there is no reason to doubt was brought out by the author himself. It seems most correct to believe that he died in the latter part of the century. In that case he must have been a very old man, and the publication of the *Peplus Italiæ*, when, so far as one can judge, he was bordering on eighty years of age,

<sup>35</sup> Compare the entry by Georgii (*Allgemeines Europaisches Bucher Lexikon*, 1742, III. p. 225): 1578. J. M. Toscani *Peplus Italiæ*, seu de ejus viis doctis diss., 12. Paris, Morell. 6 gr.

<sup>36</sup> *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, no date, T. XLII., p. 2.

shows that he must have been possessed of remarkable energy and vitality.

30. Nothing as yet has been said of the book of epigrams ascribed to Joannes Matthæus Toscanus by Draudius, and after him by Zedler. The book has entailed some additional confusion, but it need not detain us. The title, as given by Draudius (II. 1534), is as follows :—

Io. Matth. Toscani Anthologia epigrammatum, nunc primum edita. Geneu. apud Petr. & Jacob. Chouet. 1619 in 8°.

The copy I have seen has a different imprint :—

1619. M. Toscani Anthologia Epigrammatum nunc primum edita. Byrdigalae, Apud Gilbertum Vernoy, MDCXIX. Small 12mo.

Copies of this edition are in the University Library, Cambridge, and in the Advocates' Library. There is a re-issue :—

M. Toscani Romani Anthologia Epigrammatum. Nunc primum edita. Burdigalæ, 1620. 12°.

of which there is a copy in the British Museum (11409, a. 31), and it is also mentioned by De Angelis.

Although this collection is ascribed to Joannes Matthæus Toscanus, it cannot very well be by him. If, as stated above, Toscanus was born at the close of the fifteenth century, he was probably dead before the end of the sixteenth century, whereas the present editor must have been alive in 1619.

The book announces distinctly that it was first published in that year, and the epistle by the author is dated Kal. Jun. MDCXIX. If this be also by the author of the *Peplus*, etc., it must be assumed either, 1°, that he lived certainly to 1619, which is contrary to all probability, publishing nothing between 1578 and 1619, or, 2°, that this was a posthumous publication with the date of the preface altered to suit the date of the publication, which would be a mere assertion to support the theory of identity. Otherwise, the authors are two distinct persons.

On this point De Angelis is quite clear, asserting that they are different, and that the present person died at Condom in 1624. I have myself no doubt that they are different.<sup>37</sup>

But curiously enough, the fact of the editor of this anthology be-

<sup>37</sup> "Il ne faut pas confondre cet auteur [Jo. M. Toscanus] avec un autre Matthieu Toscano, Romain, qui, après avoir publié un recueil intitulé *Anthologia epigrammatum, nunc primum edita*, Bordeaux, 1620, in 8°, mourut à Condom en 1624. *Ibid.*, T. XLII., p. 2.

ing called *Romanus* does not distinguish him from J. Matthæus Toscanus the poet, as De Angelis seems to imply. For if reference be made to the elegy on Turnebus (§ 22), it will be seen that the very same title is applied to its author. In fact it is the only argument in favour of the *Anthologia* having been compiled by the poet, if such a thing were not rendered improbable by actual dates. If the identity could be established, Joannes Matthæus Toscanus must have lived for 125 years or more. If he had, I fancy we should have heard of it in some other way.

31. What little we know about Joannes Matthæus Lunensis is obtained from the dedicatory epistle to Geduinus prefixed by Agostino Giustiniani to the tract *De Rerum Inventoribus*. Matthæus received the name of Lunensis because he was a native of Luna in Tuscany. What Giustiniani says in his dedication about the state of the place in Matthæus' time is sufficiently striking.

Luna, a city of Etruria, was celebrated by authors both on its own account and for its splendid harbour, but now it is remarkable only for the vastness of its ruins, out of which are dug up daily marble monuments which plainly show how great it once was. The harbour, however, which was fashioned by nature and by art, retains its magnificence to this day, having only had the name of Luna changed to that of Venus, or, as some will have it, of St. Venerius. Navigators now reckon it among the harbours which at the present time are the best: for they affirm that those of Constantinople, of New Carthage, and of Luna, or of Venus, far surpass all others.<sup>38</sup>

In this district of Luna then, was born in our time a man called Joannes Matthæus, a learned rhetorician and especially a student of antiquity. It is he who put forth a book "*De mulieribus claris*"—of illustrious women—which we will shortly render accessible to all students. For in it there is besides unusual learning, a very pleasing variety of matter.

He had over and above begun a book "*De rerum inventoribus*," which although he has left it imperfect, I am glad nevertheless, to share

---

<sup>38</sup> Small blame to Giustiniani for his praise of this harbour, which is better known as the Gulf of Spezia, the head quarters of the Italian fleet. It had been spoken of in similar terms by Strabo and Ptolemy, by Etnius and Silius Italicus, long before Giustiniani's<sup>39</sup> time, and, not to be behind any of these, the modern guidebook calls it "one of the largest, safest and most convenient in Europe."<sup>40</sup>

Luna, itself, however, is some distance from the Gulf, and is separated from it by a range of hills. Portus Veneris or Porto Veneri, is situated on the Western promontory of the bay opposite the Isola Palmaria. The harbour of Spezia is only one of several smaller harbours of the Gulf. At the present day the fame of Luna is connected with the quarries of Carrara marble.

<sup>39</sup> *Ennii Fragmenta* ed. Hesselius, Amstel, 1707, p. 3 and note.

<sup>40</sup> Baedeker, *Handbook to Northern Italy*, 1805.

with students, so that the labours of my friend may not be altogether lost. And as the unfinished book needed a patron and guardian, you alone occurred to me, as the person to whom I should entrust the protection of the vigils of my friend most accomplished in letters and deserving well of them. For it is no secret to me how willingly and graciously you afford your patronage, most noble-minded Geduinus, to learned men. Which courtesy as you are wont to confer so readily of your own free will upon the living, you will show also to the dead; either for my sake, whom you have always loved, and for the merit of the author himself now done with life, or above all, because whatever office is performed for the dead, is esteemed not only for its humanity, but for reverence and religion, of which you have always been a zealous adherent.

Accept of this tiny booklet with the same spirit as that with which you are wont to receive all things, whether great or small, which proceed from your friends.

Farewell. Paris, April 15, 1520.

32. From this dedication we can draw six inferences.—1, That the author was dead by April 15, 1520; 2, That he wrote two books; 3, That he did not live to complete his second work; 4, That he did not himself publish either of them; 5, That they were edited by Giustiniani; 6, That the *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus* came out before the *De Mulieribus Claris*.

33. We have no clue from this as to the date and age of the writer, but it may be conjectured that he died comparatively young, having only begun his literary labours. Assuming that he was as much as thirty years old and died shortly before 1520, he would have been born about 1490. Anyhow he must have been junior to Polydore Vergil, as he was most probably junior to his own editor, who was born in 1470. Nevertheless, he is quoted by Lessing,<sup>41</sup> not only because he supplied him with certain facts, but “because he is older than Polydore Vergil.” I do not know on what ground Lessing could have made such a statement, for surely he must have known that Vergil’s book appeared in 1499, twenty-one years before that of Matthæus.

34. The only other scrap of biography is what he himself tells us. While staying at Padua he saw a Sicilian surgeon, named Baltazar Pavonus, making an artificial nose, and helped him in his operations sometimes, to the best of his ability. This surgeon was a pupil of Branca, also a Sicilian, who invented a method of renewing ears, noses and lips, which had been lost or cut off.<sup>42</sup> These were

<sup>41</sup> *Kollektanen zur Literatur*, Berlin 1790, II. p. 144.

<sup>42</sup> *De Rerum Inventoribus*, 1613, p. 37.

prior to Tagliacozzi, who lived between 1546 and 1599. Branca used the skin of the forehead, while Tagliacozzi used that of the arm.

35. The bibliography of the works of Joannes Matthæus, if limited, is very far from simple, and it is hardly possible to disjoin the consideration of the two books concerned. The main difficulty arises in connection with the reputed first editions of each, and incidentally as to which of them appeared first.

36. Giustiniani, who, as literary executor and editor, must certainly have known best, states clearly in his preface to the *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus*, dated 1520, that it was this tract which was going to appear first, to be followed at an early date by the *Opus De Mulieribus Claris*: "Is ille est, qui librum edidit de mulieribus claris, quem nos propediem communem studiosis omnibus faciemus. In eo enim præter eruditionem non vulgarem, est etiam non iniucunda rerum varietas. Aggressus insuper fuerat Joannes Matthæus noster opus de rerum inventoribus, quod quamvis imperfectum reliquerit, libuit nihilo minus illud studiosis impertire, ne amici hominis labores omnino deperirent."

37. In Gesner's *Bibliotheca*, where only the treatise *De Mulieribus Claris* is mentioned, it is assigned to the year 1520: *Joannis Matthæi Lunensis opus de mulieribus claris . . . excusum Parisiis*, 1520; and then it is said to contain not only "uncommon learning, but a pleasing variety of matter:" "in eo præter eruditionem non vulgarem est etiam non iniucunda rerum varietas," which are exactly the words employed by Giustiniani.

The edition of 1520 is mentioned also by Draudius and by Teissier (supr. § 12). The title, however, as given by Draudius (I. p. 1198) runs thus: *Mulierum commendationes historicæ*.

Beckmann,<sup>43</sup> who is usually accurate, commits, when quoting Gesner's *Bibliotheca*, p. 394 b, the error of dating it Paris, 1523. Gesner makes no such statement.

38. With regard to this book I can find no information that shows either its scope or extent, beyond what I have just quoted.

I know of no copy; I have never seen one for sale; it is in no library catalogue which I have consulted; it is not mentioned by writers on rare books. The reference to it in Gesner may have been from an actual copy; but I doubt it, because the description which he adds is in the very words used by Giustiniani in the

<sup>43</sup> *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Erfindungen*, Leipzig, 1792, III. p. 559.

preface to the other. If this book exist, and I question whether Giustiniani ever carried his promise into effect, it must be the rarest of the rare. So far as I know there was no reissue of it at a later date.

39. As to the *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus*, it may have been printed in 1520; at all events that is the date of the Epistle. Of this book also I can find no copy in the catalogue of any library, or any description of it by bibliographers. It is not in the British Museum, and the author is omitted by Ebert, Brunet, and Graesse. All this is, of course, no proof of its non-existence, but it is a proof of its rarity.

40. Curiously enough Gesner makes its existence possible, although he omits it from his list, by couching his remarks about Matthæus' other tract in Giustiniani's own words.

This coincidence, which really introduces much difficulty, seems to me to be accounted for only in one of four ways:—

1°. Gesner must have copied the remark from the original MS., or a transcript thereof, of Giustiniani's preface to the tract *De Rerum Inventoribus*; or,

2°. He must have taken it from a printed copy of that preface. It could not be from the edition of 1613, and that of 1520 is the only other presumptive one. This is therefore an indirect proof of its existence; or,

3°. After having seen a copy of the 1520 edition of the *Opus De Mulieribus Claris* which he records, he contrived to express independently, the very same opinion of it as Giustiniani—its intending editor—did, and in exactly the same words as Giustiniani used about it in the preface to the *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus*, written before the *Opus De Mulieribus Claris* had appeared! or,

4°. In the 1520 edition of the *Opus De Mulieribus Claris*, Giustiniani repeats the opinion he had already expressed about it in the preface to the previously edited *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus* and Gesner copied it as a convenient description.

On these alternatives the following observations may be offered: The first is possible, but not very probable. The second is obviously both possible and probable, but cannot be confirmed for want of a copy. The third is conceivable only on the assumption that Gesner had not Giustiniani's remark before him. The improbability of such a coincidence occurring under the circumstances (or under any circumstances), is so great, that this alterna-



tive may be dismissed without consideration. Gesner *must* have copied the remark from some source. The fourth alternative is possible, but, for want of a copy of the books, neither can it be substantiated. It seems also less probable than the second. For, while we know that Giustiniani made the remark in 1520 in the Epistle to the *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus*, we know nothing whatever about any edition of the other. The anomaly in the whole matter is that Gesner should quote definitely a Paris, 1520, edition of the *Opus De Mulieribus Claris*, and should describe it in terms which appear in the preface of the same date to a work presumably published sooner, which he does not quote.

All this difficulty and confusion, however, would doubtless disappear if copies of these 1520 editions could be got. In the meantime one can only draw the best conclusions possible from the very imperfect data available.

Those subsequent to Gesner who refer to the 1520 edition of the tract *De Rerum Inventoribus*, may have seen actual examples of it, but of that there is no evidence, and they may have just copied from one another.

41. If this 1520 edition ever existed it too has become hopelessly rare. It seems to have been as unprocurable in Reimmann's time, 1709. For after saying that it appeared at Paris in 1620 (which is a mistake by him for 1520) he adds: "aber anitzo allhie bey uns nicht wol zu überkommen ist."<sup>41</sup> Fortunately there was the reprint in 1613, and it is really the source of all we know about the author, as it contains Giustiniani's preface. This edition may now be described:—

Iohannis Matthæi | Lynensis | Libellvs | De Rerum In- | ventoribvs |  
Ex recognitione Aug. Iustini | Episcopi | Nebienfis. | M. Antoni  
Sabellici | De Rerum et Artium | inventoribus Poëma. |  
Hambvrgi, | In Bibliopolio Michaelis  
Heringii. | ANNO MDLXIII. |

Small 8vo. Sigs. A to E in eights; or pp [2] 76, which is an error for 78, as pp. 61-62 are repeated.

(A) Title leaf.

(A 2) *r* Aug. Iustinianvs Episcopvs Nebiensis, Roberto Gedvino, Regis Francorum à secretis, ends A 3 *r*, pp. (1)-3.

A 3 *v* Matthæus' Tract begins, and ends E 2 *r*, pp. 4-63 (*sic*).

E 2 *r* Jacobus Wimphelingius in Epitoma German.: (description of the invention of cannon and of printing) ends E 3 *r*, pp. 63-66 (*sic*).

E 4 *r* Sabellicus' poem begins, and ends E 8 *r*, pp. 67-76 (*sic*).

42. Of this edition there is a copy in the British Museum (721 b. 23 (3) ) and it is both in the Barberini Catalogue, Teissier's

<sup>41</sup> See § 13 and note.

list, Zedler's and Jöcher's *Lexicons*, and in Græsse's history. Draudius (I. p. 1155) quotes an edition of 1614, of which I know nothing. Reimmann gives the date 1620, but that seems to be a misprint for 1520. I have seen or heard of no edition of 1620. The edition of 1520 is referred to by Hallervord, König, Zedler, Jöcher and Græsse.

43. Pertinent to this edition there is a question which may be considered here. From what source was it taken? Was it printed from the original MS. which would be a hundred years old? If so, where had it been? How did it get to Hamburg? Where is it now? Or was it from a transcript of this MS.? Or had the printer a copy of an earlier edition—say of 1520—to work from?

To these questions the book itself gives no response, and as far as appearances go, this might quite well be the actual first printed edition. If that were so, Gesner's quotations could have been made only from a MS. as stated in the first alternative (§ 40). But if this were reprinted from an earlier copy, where is that copy now? It is wanted to clear up some of the doubts which cluster round the subject.

This may be the right place for a notice of the editor.

44. Augustino Giustiniani was born at Genoa in 1470. He received a careful education and wanted to join the friars preachers. His parents tried to turn him from this design and sent him to Valence. After a rapid course of dissipation which ended in a dangerous illness he returned home and ultimately joined the order in 1488. He devoted himself to the study of the Oriental languages, and in 1514 began a Polyglot Bible, of which the Psalter was published at Genoa in 1516.<sup>45</sup> In 1514 he was promoted to the see of Nebbio, in Corsica, by Leo X., which he at

<sup>45</sup> As I have a copy of this rare book and know of no description of it, the following may be useful :—

Psalterium, Hebræum, Græcū, | Arabicū, & Chaldeū, cū tribus | latinis interpretatōibus & glossis. | with corresponding titles in Hebrew, Greek, Arabic and Chaldee, printed in red and black alternately, and surrounded by a broad wood-cut border. The versions, in parallel columns, occupy both pages and run in the following order :—

On the verso : Hebrew, Latin Translation, Vulgate, Greek ; on the recto opposite : Arabic, Chaldee, Latin version and notes or Scholia. At the end is a table of errata with the colophon in the five languages, the printer's mark and the Registrum.

The Latin colophon runs thus :—

Impressit miro ingenio, Petrus Paulus | Porrus, genæ in ædibus Nicolai Iustī | niani Pauli, præside reipub. genuensi | pro Serenissimo FrancoR

once visited. He was present at the fifth Council of the Lateran in 1516-17.

Francis I. induced him to settle in Paris as his private chaplain and as teacher of Hebrew. He stayed there four years, and he also journeyed into Holland and England, where he was received by Henry VIII. He returned to France, then went to Genoa where he was wounded in a riot in 1522. He paid another visit to Rome, and finally in 1536, on a third voyage he perished with the ship when sailing from Genoa to Corsica. He was the author of several works of importance, especially the Annals of his native place published in 1537, a work to which allusion is made in the extract below from the *Peplus Italiae*.<sup>46</sup>

Just to bring the three persons chiefly concerned in the present research into touch with one another, it may not be out of place, if I give here what Toscanus says about Giustiniani (Matthæus' editor) in the *Peplus Italiae*, Paris, 1578, p. 65 ; or in Fabricius' edition, p. 456.

#### AUGUSTINUS IUSTINIANUS.

##### CVIII.

Historiam Ligurum prisco dum texit ab ævo,  
Gratus es in patriam Iustiniane tuam.  
At Solymæ et Syre reseras mysteria lingue,  
Sacraque das Arabis dum monumenta notis,  
Non patriam modò, non Italos, non denique solum  
Christicolum certas demeruisse genus :  
Sed gelidique Seythæ, et quos India tosta colorat,  
Acceptum referant quod tibi, munus habent.

Aug. Iustinianum Dominicani instituti Monachum edidit Genua, Hebraicæ, Syre, Arabicæ, et Græcæ lingue peritia clarum, quibus conscriptos sacros Hebræorum libros, additis suis non inruditis annotationibus ex Rabbīnorum fontibus derivatis publicavit : scripsit et Patriæ historiam.

45. As the present investigation is due solely to my interest in the *Libellus De Rerum Inventoribus* as connected with the bibliography of inventions, I may turn now to the consideration of that

---

Rege, prestan | ti viro Octauiano Fulgoso, anno christia | ne salutis, millesimo quingentesimo sex | todecimo mense. VIIIbri. |

There is no pagination, but signatures : A in ten, B to Z in eights, & in eight, C in six.

Apart from its rarity and from its being the first published polyglot edition of any part of the Scriptures, this book is sought after on account of the note appended to Ps. xix. referring to the author's fellow-townsmen, Columbus.

<sup>46</sup> *Biographie Universelle*, Paris, 1856, T. xvi. pp. 605-6.

book and the place it occupies in the literature of the subject with which it deals.

The first published work in modern times on the history of inventions, was compiled by Polydore Vergil in three books, and was printed in 1499 at Venice, in a small quarto volume. It is not to be expected that either the matter or the treatment of it by him would satisfy a present-day reader. Much that Vergil says is traditional and uncritical: traditional, because the statements had been handed down from the ancients by one writer after another; uncritical, because there were no facts to contradict them, and because there was no ground to doubt the accuracy and the good faith of those who made them. Vergil did his best to give a readable and reliable narrative, one that would convey the information he had amassed to those who were curious in such questions, and cared to give his book a perusal. He had his reward. For twenty years he held undisputed possession of the field. His book was a revelation to the students of his day, who knew nothing of the subject till he had discovered it and put it systematically before them. Then they saw what they had been in need of, and were grateful. During those twenty years it passed through eighteen editions, proving that it had created a want which it alone could supply. At the end of this period the author took it once more in hand, and, adding other five books, published the completed work in a small folio volume, dated 1521.

Even when later authors had tried to marshal the old facts anew and to add what had been invented after Vergil's age, his book still remained an unrivalled authority for upwards of eighty years, and edition after edition during that time appeared. Long after this, down even into last century, its influence was acknowledged, and if we can see the gradual waning of its sway, it was not because it was ever superseded on its own lines, but because the critical method had arisen, and the subject could no longer be viewed from Vergil's standpoint. So the book of more than one hundred editions, of which three and four sometimes came yearly from the press, after serving its purpose as well as most books, ceased altogether, and has become finally a mere curiosity to be reprinted in a few copies for the members of an American book club!

46. It lies outside the scope of this paper to consider the writers on the topic, subsequent to Vergil. I have enumerated them

and their works elsewhere,<sup>47</sup> and it is quite enough to mention here Pastregicus, Sardus, Sabellicus who wrote a poem *De Inventoribus Rerum*, printed along with Vergil in many editions, as well as with Matthæus, Pancioli, whose book was published in 1599, a hundred years after Vergil, Almeloveen, Paschius, Michael Maier, Gouget, and so on, down to the present time, when it is necessary to bring out yearly reports in bulky volumes, so as to keep pace with the advances in scientific discovery and technical applications.

With these I do not meddle. The present enquiry is intended to make more definite the personality of Joannes Matthæus and the individuality of his work.

47. In 1520, the year preceding the publication of Vergil's completed work, may have appeared Matthæus' tract with the same title, for as has been shown, the evidence of publication is not quite conclusive. This, so far as I know, was the next attempt to deal with the history of discovery, and thus to trespass on Vergil's domain. The encroachment, indeed, was so small, that it has passed unnoticed, and except to the searcher into the nooks and corners of literature and history, both the book and the author are unknown. The omission of the author's name from recent biographical dictionaries, the rarity of his works, the defective information about him and his writings, when his name does happen to be mentioned in the older compilations abundantly attest the oblivion into which he has fallen.

Compared with Vergil's work, this *libellus*, or booklet, is not even an outline; it is merely a series of short notes. Even so, however, it enumerates a few things not included by Vergil, so that it deserves consideration.

48. The book, as one knows it in the 1613 edition, contains twenty-four chapters. They treat of the following topics:—

- I. The first people.
- II. The invention of letters.
- III. The invention of paper.
- IV. The inventors of arts.
- V. The inventors of songs and tales.
- VI. Inventions of the heathen gods.
- VII. Inventions of kings and chiefs.
- VIII. Inventions of philosophers.

---

<sup>47</sup> "Notes on Histories of Inventions and Books of Secrets," 1882-1898 in the *Transactions of the Archaeological Society*, Glasgow.

- IX. Inventions of poets.
- X. Inventions of different nations.
- XI. Inventors of ships and their belongings.
- XII. Inventions of Christians.
- XIII. Inventors of implements of war.
- XIV. Inventors of metals, various arts, fabrics and tools.
- XV. Inventors of musical instruments.
- XVI. Inventions of painters.
- XVII. Medicines discovered by animals.
- XVIII. Inventors of the uses of plants.
- XIX. Discovery of certain fruits.
- XX. The use of animals.
- XXI. Inventors of games.
- XXII. Inventors of crimes and punishments.
- XXIII. Inventors of foods.
- XXIV. Inventions and ordinances first made at Rome.

These, which are probably the author's own divisions of the subject, are followed in the 1613 edition by two paragraphs on the discovery of fire-arms and of printing respectively, taken from the *Epitome Germanicarum Rerum*, by Wimpheling.

49. The accounts given are the briefest possible, seldom going beyond two or three lines, and they are mere headings, or texts that could be, and in some cases have been, amplified by others. One merit that Matthæus has is that he adds the authorities for most of his statements. They are not what we should call critical or reliable at the present day, but they were all that could be had four hundred years ago. A list of them may be given, partly to show who were considered good authorities, partly to illustrate the nature and extent of Matthæus' research. They may be arranged alphabetically for convenience :—

Acron.	Gellius.	Ovidius.
Aquinas.	Heraclides Ponticus.	Plato.
Aristotle.	Herodotus.	Plinius.
Ausonius.	Hieronymus.	Politianus.
Bracelleus.	Horatius.	Priscianus.
Callimachus.	Hyginus.	Plutarchus.
Capella.	Josephus.	Quintilianus.
Cicero.	Justinus.	Seneca.
Columella.	Juvenalis.	Servius.
Cyprianus.	Lactantius.	Strabo.
Diodorus Siculus.	Lampridius.	Tacitus.
Diogenes Laertius.	Livius.	Theophrastus.
Donatus.	Lucanus.	Valerius Maximus.
Eusebius.	Macrobius.	Varro.
Festus.	Martialis.	Vegetius.
Florus.	Mela.	Virgilius.

50. Consideration of these authorities will give one a fair notion of the information Matthæus had. As they, with one or two exceptions, are Greek and Latin, obviously he could do no more than repeat what he finds in them. As they in turn, and the Greeks more particularly, ignored other nations, and, founding on their own traditions, claimed as far as might be all inventions for themselves, any approach to a reasonable insight into antiquity, as would be demanded now, is not to be looked for; in fact it could not have existed, and the various statements must be judged of with this proviso.

In these authorities there is no idea of the growth or development of an art or science from small beginnings till it reaches a fully developed state, but to some definite personage, or it may be vaguely or comprehensively to certain tribes or nations, various inventions are said to be due. The course of events was in this wise: nothing of a given kind existed until a certain person appeared, the inventions followed, and forthwith it was adopted generally. There are claims for inventions on behalf of this or that deity or hero, king or warrior, priest or philosopher, statesman or poet, which, in so far as the personage is mythical or symbolical, could be hardly substantiated as matter of fact. The first discovery, whatever it was, must be looked for in a different way.

On the other hand there are inventions, or modifications of those already known, which might be quite well due to individuals, and even to those mentioned. That is a question of evidence.

51. When Matthæus comes nearer to his own time and gets out of the range of classical influence, he refers to some novelties in such a way as to make us regret he had not included more of them, and left the poetical and legendary discoveries of Pliny, Ovid, and others for the edification of the schoolboy, instead of recording them as authentic and worthy of consideration as historical facts.

That grammar, for example, logic, rhetoric, music, ethics, and so forth were invented by specified individuals, usually of Greek nationality, shows how rudimentary the motions were with which Matthæus had to be content. Even in certain instances there was a want of agreement, as when it was stated that the hexameter was first used by Ennius, or by Moses: or that Solomon wrote the first Epithalamium, though elsewhere Apollo is named as the author of the first nuptial song, on the occasion of the marriage of Peleus and Thetis.

The invention of medicine, again, is ascribed to half-a-dozen different persons.

Joseph was the first interpreter of dreams.

Sardanapalus was the first to make a bed of feathers.

Endymion was the first to understand the nature of the moon ; Parmenides to show the identity of the evening and morning star.

Cæsar first ordained that the daily acts of the senate and people should be drawn up and published.

Sergius Orata first invented oyster ponds, and gave the pre-eminence to the Lucrine oyster for flavour.

Neptune was the first breaker-in of horses and taught the art of riding.

Publius Malleolus (good name) having killed his mother, was the first to be sewn in a leather bag and thrown into the sea. Some other ingenious tortures are described.

The Cyclopes were the first builders of towers, says Aristotle, but Theophrastus, the Phœnicians.

These, taken at random, and many similar statements, are not all of like character, do not rest on similar evidence, and are not of the same degree of probability.

52. Even in the works of the ancients themselves, as of Pliny, whose very words Matthæus transfers to his pages, one must distinguish between what they repeated as legends and what they knew as matters of fact, possibly because they fell out during their own life time. There is not much of a difference perhaps between the statements that a reed pipe was made by Pan and that purple was used for the toga prætexta by Tullus Hostilius, but it is more reasonable to believe that M. Agrippa was the first to receive a naval crown, than that Pluto invented navigation and was made admiral of a fleet by Saturn. It is more credible that Caius Gracchus first put up milestones, and “louping-on stanes”<sup>48</sup> than that a snake, after hibernating, restores its sight by rubbing itself with fennel, or if scales have grown over its eyes picks them off with juniper spines. A person of the name of Mercury may have invented the lyre, but there is much stronger evidence that another person, Pompeius Magnus, was the first to complete the building of a permanent theatre of hewn stone in Rome.

But to begin to review the contents of this booklet would be to

---

<sup>48</sup> Lessing (*Kollektaneen*, Berlin, 1790, II. p. 149), says he does not know the authority for this. His editor shows that it is Plutarch.



undertake not a criticism of Matthæus—for after all he only copied what he read—but a criticism of his authorities ; in short to compile a treatise on Antiquities. To what extent that would run at the present day it would be hard to say, no one person could survey it all ; the field is so vast, and the knowledge, imperfect though it be still, is so specialised. Anyone, however, who has the curiosity to see what could be said on the subject by one person, a century ago, can refer to Rollin or to Goguet.

53. It may not be out of place, however, to refer very briefly to the inventions which were post-classical and in certain cases contemporaneous with Matthæus himself. These, indeed, merit special attention for, according to Lessing, they seem to have been chronicled by Matthæus for the first time. They occur in chapter xii., and are the following :—

Albertus Magnus invented fire arms and artillery.<sup>49</sup> Branca, a Catanian, introduced the method of restoring noses, lips and ears. His pupil was Baltazar Pavonus, a Sicilian, who practised this art at Padua, and Matthæus when there, assisted him, as has been said above (§ 34).

To a woman named Saint Cita, of Lucca, he ascribes the invention of putting gold on leather, so as to make what were called *auripelles* ; for which her festival is observed annually with the greatest honour. This leather was used for wall decoration and for covering chairs.<sup>50</sup>

He refers to a modification of this art, in which plates of silver were fastened on skins and then coloured yellow to resemble gold. These were also called *auripelles*, and the invention, a new one, was claimed by the Messenians.

Michael Scotus the famous astrologer, invented an iron skull-cap. He alludes to this also in cap. xiii., p. 44 under the

<sup>49</sup> Naudé (*Apologie pour tous les grands Personages . . . soupçonnez de Magie*, Paris, 1625, p. 518), quotes this statement as opposed to current opinion, from "Iean Mathieu de Luma, *Lib. de rerum inventorib.* cap. 12, f. 10," one of the few references to our author I have fallen in with. Unfortunately, Naudé has omitted the date of the edition he used, and I do not know precisely what he meant by "f. 10." It is natural to suppose that the 1613 edition, not long published, would be in his possession. But if "f. 10" mean "folio 10," it does not apply to the 1613 edition, in which the reference to Albertus is on p. 37, and that to Wimpfelingius is on p. 64. Can Naudé have been referring to the 1520 edition, or to a MS. ?

<sup>50</sup> Lessing, *Kollektaneen*, Berlin, 1790, I. p. 94. He refers to Cardan *De Rer. Var.* lib. XIII. c. 56. [Imitations of this "Venetian" leather have been introduced within the last dozen or twenty years. May, 1900].

inventors of arms. Lessing<sup>51</sup> is much puzzled as to what this *galea ferrea* could have been or for what purpose. It was also called *cervilerium*, and Michael contrived and wore it so as to ward off the fate which he had foreseen was to befall him. The legend is that he knew he should be killed by the fall of a stone upon his head, so as a protection he wore this head guard. But in vain. For being in church and uncovering at the mass, a small stone fell from the roof and striking his head caused his death. The legend seems therefore to have been known when the iron cap is mentioned as a discovery of Michael's.

A timepiece with a striking arrangement was a Christian invention, like that of *bells*, which were first cast at Nola, in Campania. The ancients had only water and solar timekeepers.

Stirrups, which are not seen on Roman statues, flails, and the rest in which the lance was put, are all modern inventions.

Water mills are modern, but wind mills are much more recent. The ancients had only hand mills and mills driven by asses.

Angelus Barroellus, a Venetian, made colours and pictures of glass and crystal. As Lessing points out (*u. supr.* I. p. 213), this can apply only to the revival of an art in which the ancients were skilful.

The use of the magnetic needle is modern. It is curious that while aware of its importance for navigation he should have made no reference to contemporary geographical discovery, though he was living in the very midst of it, and Luna is not far from Genoa.

Printing was found out in Germany "after the Christian era," Prior to that Saturnus taught the Italians to print letters, as Cyprian narrates in his book *De idolis*, and Matthæus alludes to the same thing in cap. II.

Wooden platters on which to cut meat were first devised in the days of Frederick, the Roman King, and of Pope Gregory, who also placed the divine Dominic, founder of the order of preachers, among the saints.

Not long after arose the Flagellants, who went about in pairs or in bands and scourged each other with whips. They were founded by a Cardinal, Jacobus Columna.

At this same time, by divine judgment, it was caused that all the French in Sicily, religious and secular, perished "una die, unaque voce Dei." In such reticent terms Matthæus refers to the *Sicilian Vespers*.

---

<sup>51</sup> Lessing, *Kollektanen*, Berlin, 1790, II. p. 351.

At this time, also in Sicily, was the fish-man, Nicolaus, a Mes-senian, who lived in the sea, and revealed many of its secrets to men. "He chose this inhuman mode of life after being cursed by his mother." He was quite a well-known personage, and is noticed by Lessing (II. p. 193).

The fabricating of paper, sails, and clothes from cotton is a recent discovery.

A ball full of air for playing with, which might be called an "air-ball," is a recent invention, although we read that boys of old played with a "follis" or leather skin full of wind; but that (he thinks) was different, for modern "air balls" were devised by Marchio of Ferrara. But it is difficult to see in what the difference consists.

Tallow candles were first made in Ferrara. They were unknown to the ancients.

The training of birds for hunting, such as different kinds of owls, is a Christian invention; for the ancients used dogs for bird catching.

The making of spectacles, or eye-glasses, from glass, or crystal, or beryl, Matthæus thinks, is an ancient rather than a modern discovery.

A spear-shaft drilled longitudinally, through which little clay pellets sufficient to kill birds, could be shot by blowing, is a recent discovery. He begs pardon of the learned for proposing to call it *tuba aucupatoria* on the analogy of *arca aucupatoria*, *per-tica aucupatoria*, *calami aucupatorii*, *rete aucupatorium*. We could translate it "fowling-tube," having already fowling-piece. It is analogous to the "blow-pipe" for shooting darts employed by the Indians of the Amazon. There is a note by Lessing on the Italian name, *Ciarbottana*, of this contrivance, in the *Kollekanteen*, I. p. 119.

These observations have so far the merit of originality, and in that respect differ from the rest of the book. In the very general terms, too, employed, Matthæus unconsciously recognises the difficulty of assigning an invention to its author, and this, too, is in marked contrast to the rest of the book.

54. In attempting to estimate Matthæus' work fairly and to do him justice, certain considerations have to be borne in mind.

a. The time at which it was composed, when there was no possibility of systematic enquiry into the subject of invention and discovery, and when every statement was based for want of better

upon mere authority, classical or other. It may be questioned if anyone, compiling a book of origins at the present day, would not, in many instances at least, give expression to opinions as vague, contradictory, and controvertible, as anything to be found in Matthæus.

*b.* As Giustiniani warns us this is not a complete or finished work, but only the author's first notes, put down very briefly under their respective heads, sometimes with the names of the authorities, sometimes without them, but often in the latter case easily traceable.

*c.* The apparent ascription of the same inventions to several persons may be due solely to the unfinished condition of the work. Matthæus, very properly, took note of everything he found, and he may have meant to discuss, subsequently, the authority for the various statements and decide in accordance with the evidence. From variety of recorded opinion it must not be inferred that Matthæus had drawn no definite conclusions, or was incapable of doing so.

*d.* Although, in most instances, the statements are mere memoranda, yet to have obtained even these displays an amount of research, of examination, and of knowledge of what had been written on the subject, both professedly and incidentally by Greek and Latin authors, which reflects credit upon Matthæus. I think one is quite entitled to be grateful to Giustiniani for not allowing the work to perish.

55. The question may be fairly asked to what extent – if any – may Matthæus have been indebted to earlier writers on the same topic. One can hardly judge of this little pamphlet without comparing it with those which preceded it, and singularly enough all the early histories which I know are by Italians, and they cover so nearly the same ground that it is difficult not to believe that one took the idea from another.

The earliest writer was Pastregicus whose work *De Originibus Rerum*, though not printed till 1547, was written in the first half of the fourteenth century. Matthæus may have seen this in MS., and may have used it, but there is no evidence on the point. There is a great difference in the arrangement of the two, for while the order in the older work is alphabetical by the names of the inventors, that in Matthæus' is by groups of inventions, as can be seen by the index of chapters. But in both cases we are furnished with mere notes and authorities.

The next is Zacharias Lilius who published a volume in 1496 at Vicenza, which includes the history of the Arts. He confines himself, however, to the seven liberal arts, the *trivium* and *quadrivium* and their adjuncts, and says nothing about practical inventions. Even supposing Matthæus had been guided by Lilius in the former section, he must have gathered his details respecting the practical arts from other sources.

Polydore Vergil's book followed in 1499, and making every allowance for its more elaborate character there is sufficient resemblance between these two books of all but identical title, to make one think that Matthæus may have had Vergil's work beside him when he was drawing up his own tract.

Both Vergil and Matthæus, although it does not appear obtrusively, follow to a certain extent the *trivium* and *quadrivium*, and there is hardly anything in Matthæus which could not be found in Vergil, often in nearly the same words. But that by no means implies direct copying on Matthæus' part, but really the use of the same authorities. Such repetition is common to all the historians referred to above, so that it is not possible to attach importance to it. Whether Matthæus copied not only the words but the references as well, so as to make it appear a reference of his own is a question which could be discussed, if it were necessary.

56. The remarks now made may be sufficient to give a notion of the scope of this "libellus," all that remains of its author's labour and learning. What may have been his ultimate design, one can hardly conjecture. Perhaps, like Gregory Reisch, his contemporary, he had simply made notes for his own use without any intention of printing them, and his name might have passed into absolute oblivion. Thanks to Giustiniani he has been rescued from forgetfulness, and the tiny vessel which has successfully floated his name down to us after its perilous voyage across four centuries, has been seen and "spoken with" by others at intervals of fifty or a hundred years.

Michael Heringius who printed or re-printed the book in 1613, Almeloveen<sup>52</sup> who in 1684 reported it as a history *ex professo*, Lessing who in 1790 used it as an authority, Beckmann who in 1792 included it in his list of histories of inventions, and a few more, some with clear observation, others confusedly, have all helped to give Matthæus his place. After the lapse of another

---

<sup>52</sup> *Rerum Inventorum Onomasticon*, Amstelædami, 1684, Epistle, A<sub>2</sub> verso.

century, during which time the frail craft had passed completely out of sight, it has come once more to land and I hope the attempt to recognise its character and identify its owner has not been unsuccessful.

57. After what has been said it is not difficult to understand how confusion between the two men has arisen :—the similarity of the name ; the supposition that Lunensis and Toscanus were place epithets, and were practically the same, because Luna is in Tuscany ; their both belonging to the same century ; their works being nominally edited by others ; a certain analogy between their subjects, for while Matthæus Lunensis wrote about distinguished women, Toscanus in his *Peplus* recites the achievements of notable Italian men. But though the mistake of identification may be palliated by such explanations or excuses as the preceding, any of the following equally patent considerations should have been sufficient to raise a doubt at least as to identity being possible or even probable.

a. There is an interval of nearly fifty years between the two sets of publications.

Giustiniani, in 1520, speaks of Lunensis as dead, and having left his historical notes behind him. One can conceive it possible that the Latin poems might have lain in manuscript till Dorat discovered and published them. But that is untenable, for Toscanus was a personal friend of Dorat's, and his poem on Turnebus was written and published in 1565. Moreover in the *Peplus*, first published in 1578, Toscanus has the above-quoted laudatory poem on Giustiniani, who was drowned in 1536, and this fact alone is quite enough to show that Matthæus and Toscanus are different. The obituary runs thus: Matthæus died before 1520, Giustiniani in 1536, Toscanus after 1578 (?) Dorat in 1588.

b. There is no reference—as, indeed, how could there be?—by Giustiniani to writings by Matthæus except the two already specified, and on the other hand there is no allusion to either of the earlier works in those connected with Toscanus. For the identification, therefore, by Hallervord, and later by Zedler and others, there is no support in the works themselves, or in any observation of their respective editors.

c. Lunensis is an epithet from Matthæus' birthplace. Toscanus, whatever it may have meant originally, is a family name, and has nothing to do with the birthplace of the person.

d. While certain authorities have confused the two, others have distinguished them with more or less precision.

It is certain now to my mind that the two writers were different persons. I myself following my guides without sufficient examination repeated their mistake. I am glad of this opportunity to state what is really the correct view of the matter, and to amend my former account.

5  
May  
1864









# JOANNES MATTHÆUS AND HIS TRACT

“DE RERUM INVENTORIBUS.”

PART II.

---

BY

JOHN FERGUSON,

M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., F.S.A.,

PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

---

GLASGOW :

PRINTED FOR THE ROYAL PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY  
OF GLASGOW.

1916.



# JOANNES MATTHÆUS AND HIS TRACT

“DE RERUM INVENTORIBUS.”

PART II.

---

BY

JOHN FERGUSON,

M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.E., F.S.A.,

PROFESSOR OF CHEMISTRY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

---

GLASGOW :

PRINTED FOR THE ROYAL PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY  
OF GLASGOW

1816.



*Joannes Matthæus Lunensis and his tract "De Rerum Inventoribus."* Part II. By JOHN FERGUSON, LL.D., Emeritus-Professor of Chemistry in the University of Glasgow.

---

[Read before the Society, Wednesday, December 15th, 1915.]

---

1. To a meeting of the Society on December 4th, 1901, everything that I had been able to discover about Matthæus was communicated.<sup>1</sup> It will be necessary to recall two or three particulars which have a bearing on the position which the subject has recently acquired.

2. Matthæus compiled two books, one on notable women, which he had finished, the other upon inventors, the completion of which was interrupted by his death. Thereupon the books were taken in hand by a personal friend, Agostino Giustiniani, bishop of Nebbio in Corsica. He first revised the tract on inventors, in order, as he says, that it might not be lost to scholars, prefixed a dedication to Robertus Geduinus, secretary of the French King, containing a short biographical notice of the author, and referred incidentally to the book about illustrious women, which on account of its interest and learning he expressed his intention shortly to publish, but in the meantime begged the dedicatee to accept the present work. This dedication is dated April 15th, 1520.

3. In the original paper two questions had to be left over for consideration. They were these :—

1° Was the tract "*De Rerum Inventoribus*" printed in 1520?

2° Was the tract "*De Mulieribus Claris*" printed in 1520, or was it printed at all?

The reason for not answering these questions was that no copy of either work of that date was at the time known by me to exist.

4. With regard to the first question certain indications of the book about inventors having been printed in 1520 were detailed. They may now be recapitulated.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings*, Vol. XXXIII., page 180.

(a) There are the dedication and date, 1520, as of an actually printed book.

(b) There is Gesner's quotation in 1545 (referred to below §11), from this same dedication, which he could hardly have taken except from a copy of that edition.

(c) There is the Hamburg edition of 1613, with Giustiniani's dedication dated 1520. It might be suggested that it was the first edition, but this raises so many problems, of which there is no solution, that the supposition will not bear examination (see Part I., §43).

It is more reasonable to believe that Michael Hering, the publisher, was lucky enough to acquire somehow a copy of a 1520 edition, and had it reprinted.

(d) There are references by several authorities to a 1520 edition, but not much weight can be attached to that fact. None of them seems to have had personal acquaintance with it, and they may have repeated one another.

(e) The most curious and, at the same time, the most conclusive proof of the existence of an edition different from that of 1613, and possibly, therefore, of 1520, is the reference by Gabriel Naudé to the book of inventors by Matthæus, "*f.* 10." As I pointed out in the first paper (§53), if this signify "*folio* 10," it does not apply to the 1613 edition, in which the passage quoted occurs on *page* 37. Naudé gives no date, but only a 1520 edition is probable.

5. With these proofs and possibilities, but without the conclusive evidence of an actual copy of a book which I pronounced as "hopelessly rare," the subject has lain dormant for the last fourteen years, so far as I have been concerned.

6. A few weeks ago when turning over the sheets, now printing, of the catalogue of the Hunterian Library in the University,<sup>2</sup> I came upon the entry: *Joannes Matthæus, De*

---

<sup>2</sup> Had I examined this library in 1901, the book to be now described would have been discovered. It would have saved some speculation, but this result has followed from the omission, that the discussion has been justified by the book itself and the deductions have been confirmed.

My excuse—and it is not a valid one—for neglecting a library which was immediately accessible to me, must be its catalogue which did not invite consultation, and, what was almost a corollary, the assumption—quite unjustifiable—that the book was not one likely to be present, and there was therefore no need to look for it. But for the new printed catalogue, therefore, the book might never have come to my knowledge.





DE RERVM INVENTORIBVS AVRE-  
us libellus, quē Ioannes Matthæus Lunēsis, cudebat.

Ex recognitione. A. Iustiniani Episcopi  
Nebienſis.

CASTIGABAT VATELEVS.



A. DE LA BARRE

Vænalis sub signo diui Ioannis Baptistæ è re-  
gione Collegij Langbardorum

*Rerum Inventoribus aureus libellus* . . . Parisus . . . 1520, which gave at once a categorical affirmative to the first question. Immediate reference to "J. 10," settled definitely that it was the 1520 edition that had been used by Naudé in 1625.

7. If it be asked how the work of an Italian author, even if composed in Latin, edited by an Italian bishop, came to be printed in Paris, a reply has been already given in the first paper, §44. Giustiniani had published the polyglot Psalter at Genoa, in 1516, and had won the reputation of being an Oriental linguist and scholar, when he was invited to Paris by Francis I. to act as his chaplain and to teach Hebrew. When there he put the present work through the press, which explains the dedication to the French King's secretary, the date 1520, and Paris as the place of printing.

8. A description of the book follows.

DE RERVM INVENTORIBVS AVRE-  
us libellus, quē Ioannes Matthæus Lunēfis eudebat.

Ex recognitione, A. Iustiniani Episcopi  
Nebienfis.

[Printer's Device.]

Vanalis sub signo dñi Ioannis Baptistæ é re-  
gione Collegij Langbardorum

F. Size of the page,  $7\frac{7}{8}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$ ; size of the printed portion,  $6\frac{5}{8}'' \times 3\frac{3}{4}''$ . A to D in fours; or, Ff. xvi., numbered; but D.ij., which is Fo. xiv., is misnumbered Fo. xiii., and D.ijj. (or Fo. xv.) is misnumbered Fo. xiv. l. D.iiij. is correctly numbered Fo. xvi. Roman letter. Large, medium and small sized ornamental capitals. 39 lines to the page, excluding the running title and the signature line. There are no catchwords. There are a few contractions.

The florid title-page with the device of Nicole De La Barre will be better understood by the accompanying fac simile, than by any description. A copy of this form of the device is given in L.-C. Silvestre's *Marques Typographiques*, Paris, 1853, No. 335. A variation is seen in No. 91, and in A. Claudin's *Histoire de l'Imprimerie en France au XV.<sup>e</sup> et au XVI.<sup>e</sup> Siecle*, Paris, 1900-1904: 1901, T. II., p. 301.

Collation.

(A.j. Fo. 1. r) is the title-page.

(A.j. Fo. 1. r) Epistola | Nuncupatoria. | Aug. Iustinianus,  
Episcopus Nebienfis, Rober- | to Geduino,  
Regio Francorum à secretis. + S. |  
ends A.ij. Fo. ii. r dated :  
Vale Parrhisijs. XVI. Calend. Maias. |  
MDXX. |

A.ij. Fo. ii. r. The text begins, and ends on D.iiij. Fo. xvi. r.  
The verse is blank.

The book contains xxiii. chapters.

D.iiij., or Fo. xvi. *recto*, ends with the entry about Agrippa and the naval crown, and is followed by the word Finis. Then come a few lines by Giustiniani to the reader, which may be quoted as giving some information about the book.

Ad Lectorem.

Memineris Candide lector, plerumq; & mæca i hoc opere, & imperfecta relictæ ab autore, sicuti i liminari epistola de ducta est. Inter q̃ sequentia maxime animaduertas, licet, Ne pe i capite, xiiij. vbi de metallis agitur, Stann, Argeto viuu, Criftallu, marmor, nitru, corallu, argilla, & reliqua id gen<sup>o</sup>, in albo, quasi telâ ordiens, reliquerat, nisi morte puëtus fuisset, denno abfolitur. Id quod & i multis factu coperies. Ceteru, In cap. xvij. argeto cetâdo excufu est, lege celando  
Vale.

In Barrana Chaleographia sub idus maias. M.D. XX.

This note is omitted in the edition of Hamburg, 1613, p. 61, and in it the text is succeeded immediately by the epitome of German inventions by Wimpfelingius, to p. 66, and then by the poem on inventors by Sabellius, pp. 67-76, which finishes the volume.

9. Of this 1520 edition I know at present only the copy in the Hunterian Library. From past experience, however, I expect that now that it is known to exist and has been described, other copies will gradually make their appearance, but at no time will it ever be anything else than very rare. A copy may be found in one or more of the Paris libraries, and possibly also in some of those in Italy.

10. As for the Hamburg edition there are three copies that I know of, so that it is not much more plentiful than the first. These are: one in the British Museum, one in the Hamilton



IOHANNIS MATTHÆI  
LYNENSIS  
LIBELLVS  
DE RERVVM IN-  
VENTORIBVS

*Ex recognitione Aug. Iustiniani  
Episcopi Nebiensis.*

M. ANTONII SABELLICI  
DE RERVVM ET ARTIVM  
inventoribus Poëma.



HAMEVROI,  
In Bibliopolio MICHAELIS HERINGII  
ANNO dñi 1634.

Collection, one in the Hunterian Collection, the last two in Glasgow University. This book was described in the previous paper. I now add a fac-simile of its title page, so as to complete the survey.

11. The second question still remains unanswered: was the work *De Mulieribus Claris* printed in 1520, or was it ever printed?

We know now for certain that in April, 1520, Giustiniani, in his dedication to the tract *De Rerum Inventoribus* referred to the other as learned and interesting (Part I. §§31, 36), and promised that he would publish it before long. This anticipatory estimate of the work is put by Gesner under his entry of it as if it were already published in 1520, though the book which contains the description in its dedication is not mentioned by Gesner at all. Supposing that the book *De Mulieribus Claris* did appear subsequently in 1520, that does not account for Gesner quoting from and yet omitting all mention of Matthæus' earlier work, unless on another assumption that the book *De Mulieribus Claris* repeats the description of itself in the very words printed already in Giustiniani's dedication to the previous work.<sup>3</sup> It is much more likely, both from what Gesner has included and still more from what he has omitted, that he has somehow confused the two works and misapplied or misunderstood Giustiniani's remark. Perhaps he never saw the dedication, but got the quotation from it at second hand and mistook its application.

12. Whatever the explanation be, Gesner's entry, so far as I know, is the sole authority for a 1520 edition of the work *De Mulieribus Claris*, and as it is enveloped in doubt and uncertainty I am unable to accept his statement as evidence that Giustiniani carried out his intention of printing the book, or of the existence of an edition of 1520, or that it was printed at any subsequent period.

13. Reference to this edition by Teissier and Draudius (Part I. §§12, 37) gives it no support, for both, Teissier certainly, have copied Gesner and show no personal knowledge of it. Nor is there anywhere a reference to it, or quotation from it, similar to that of Naudé already referred to. The only sufficient demonstration now of its having been printed would be the production of a copy of whatever date, only, to justify Gesner, it would have to be anterior to 1545.

---

<sup>3</sup> For want of a copy we cannot tell whether it so describes itself or not: if we had a copy of 1520 there would be no need for any discussion!

14. There is nothing so liable to be proved erroneous as the affirmation that a given book does not exist. but, so far as I am able to judge, I do not expect that I shall ever meet with and have to describe a copy of the work *De Mulieribus Claris*, composed by Joannes Matthæus Lunensis, edited by Augustinus Justinianus, Episcopus Nebiensis, and printed at Paris in 1520. But I do not say that it is impossible.

---

GLASGOW :

PRINTED BY A. BRYSON & CO., LTD., 92 TROGATE.

1916.



*Joannes Matthæus "De Rerum Inventoribus Libellus."*

---

POSTSCRIPT: 2nd October, 1916.

---

Since printing the second part of this paper, I have recovered a reference to Matthæus's book, which I noted some years ago after the first part had appeared, and which, had it been at hand, I should have used in confirmation of the argued existence of the 1520 edition long prior to my becoming acquainted with an actual example of it.

The reference occurs in Crofts's Catalogue,<sup>1</sup> and is as follows:—

5287. *De Rerum Inventoribus aureus libellus*  
Jo. Matthæi Lunensis, *ex Recognitione*  
Aug. Justiniani Episcopi Nebiensis,  
4to. in Barrana Chalcographia MDXX.

In §9 of the paper, Part II. above, it was remarked that, in all likelihood, another copy would appear sooner or later. Crofts's copy may perhaps claim the distinction of being the first to appear, unless it be suggested that it was the same which passed into Hunter's possession. That, however, did not happen for the following reason.

Hunter's death took place on March 30, 1783, but Crofts's sale did not begin till April 7, 1783. Hunter, of course, might have given directions to have the tract purchased for his library. In that case, if it was bought, the volume in which it is contained would correspond with No. 5287 in Crofts's

---

<sup>1</sup> A Catalogue of the Curious and Distinguished Library of the late Reverend and Learned Thomas Crofts, A.M., Chancellor of the Diocese of Peterborough. . . . which will be sold by auction, by Mr. Paterson, at his Great Room, No. 6 King-Street, Covent-Garden, London, on Monday, April 7, 1783, and the forty-two following days . . . 8vo.

Catalogue. As a matter of fact, however, there is no agreement between the two volumes. That lot contains not only Matthæus's work, with which it opens, but half-a-dozen other tracts.

On the other hand, Hunter's copy forms the second item in a volume along with the *Lucubrationes* of Jacobus Bracelleus, Genuensis, printed at Paris in 1520 by Josse Badius, with his usual vignette of the Ascensian press, of which book also Augustinus Justinianus was editor, an office which he discharged for his fellow-townsmen. These two tracts are bound in one volume, in brown calf blind-tooled, contemporary, or nearly so, with the printing.

They were, therefore, two different copies, whatever may have become of that which belonged to Crofts. I have no doubt that the volume containing it is still in existence. It would be worth a search.

J. F.

























































































